

REMARKS

I. Overview

These remarks are set forth in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed June 14, 2007. As this amendment has been timely filed within the six-month statutory period, but subsequent to the third month of the shortened statutory period, a one-month extension of time and associated fee is provided herewith. Presently, claims 1 through 14 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1 and 9 are independent in nature. In the Non-Final Office Action, claims 1 through 14 have been rejected on cited art. Specifically, claims 1 through 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No., 6,947,943 to DeAnna et al. (DeAnna). Additionally, claims 1 through 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In response Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to provide for the execution of the IMAP mail server in the application server and hence, the "use of a computer" as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are believed to have been overcome. Otherwise, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections on the art as the Applicants believe that DeAnna fails to show "an Internet Message Access Protocol (IMAP) compliant mail server executing in a computer and coupled to" a "logical grouping of application server nodes executing within an application server".

II. The Applicant's Invention

The Applicants have invented an IMAP server which has been programmed for integration with a collaborative messaging application within an application server. The IMAP server can include a platform independent collection of classes and can be configured to operate

within a virtual machine. To that end, the IMAP server can be a Java application which comports with the J2EE specification. The IMAP server can be communicatively coupled to a data store of messages and can respond to requests to manage the messages through the collaborative messaging application. Additionally, access to the IMAP server can be regulated by authentication logic disposed within the application server.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

A. Characterization of Frederick

Frederick discloses a lightweight application server for use on portable or embedded devices. As described in Frederick, the lightweight application server includes an application manager and services containers. Each is managed by an administrative server allowing for remote and rapid deployment and maintenance of applications, objects and features associated with the server-enabled portable or embedded devices. Consequently, portable devices like personal digital assistants are permitted to provide server functionality to each other, in a fully portable network if desired.

B. Traversal of the Rejections on the Art

Applicant's amended independent claims 1 and 9 require "an Internet Message Access Protocol (IMAP) compliant mail server executing in a computer and coupled to" a "logical grouping of application server nodes executing within an application server" as expressly shown in Figure 2 by "mail server cell 200". In Frederick, however, the term IMAP is mentioned only twice in connection with Figure 4 of Frederick--in column 15, lines 47-50 in connection with Mail Receiver 173 and in column 16, lines 29-31 in connection with Mail Sender 175. As a

cursory inspection of Figure 4 of Frederick will reveal, however, there is no teaching of a coupling of an IMAP server to a logical grouping application server nodes executing within an application server. In fact, Figure 4 admittedly only shows the interaction of an IMAP server with a "process". Nowhere in Figure 4 or the text of DeAnna is it suggested that the IMAP server is coupled to a logical grouping of application server nodes executing within an application server.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 102(e) owing to the amended claims 1 and 9 and the foregoing remarks. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 16, 2007

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3020
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Customer No. 46321
Tel: (561) 922-3845
Fax: (561) 244-1062